

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 8-11, 13, 14 and 16-24 are all of the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, 13, 18 and 21 have been amended to more particularly define the invention. Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 12 and 15 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicants specifically state that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9-13, 15, 17 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-7, 9-15, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Renslo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,446,890; hereinafter “Renslo”). Claims 8 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renslo (U.S. Patent No. 5,446,890) in view of Lu et al. (“Effective Data Mining Using Neural Networks”; hereinafter “Lu”). Claims 17 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renslo in view of Bieganski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,412,012; hereinafter “Bieganski”). Claims 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renslo in view of Bieganski and further in view of Lu. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1, 2, 3, 12 and 13 of United States Patent No. 6,732,099.

These rejections are respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

The claimed invention of exemplary claim 1 provides a computer method that includes providing a demand database including refining the data mining technique in cognizance of pattern changes embedded in the demand database and the supply database as a consequence of updating the demand database and the supply database (e.g., see Application at page 4, lines 10-13). This combination of features allows the claimed invention to use data mining techniques to solve the problem of product stockpile management (see Application at page 7, lines 1-11).

II. THE 35 U.S.C. 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH, REJECTION

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9-13, 15, 17 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that each and every feature of claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9-13, 15, 17 and 19-21 is clearly supported by the original specification.

The M.P.E.P. clearly states that “[t]o satisfy the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention” (see M.P.E.P. § 2163). Additionally, the written description requirement is satisfied if the claimed invention is described in any section of the application. That is, the invention may be disclosed in the specification, the drawings or the originally filed claims.

Regarding claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9 and 10, Applicants respectfully point out that each of these claims were originally filed in the Application. Therefore, the subject matter recited in claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9 and 10 are part of the originally filed specification and, on that basis alone, satisfy the written description.

Furthermore, the limitation “refining the data mining technique in cognizance of pattern changes embedded in said demand database and said supply database as a consequence of updating the at least one of said demand database and said supply database”, which is recited in claims 1, 9, 10 and 13, is clearly described at page 4, lines 3-5 and lines 10-14 of the originally filed specification.

The limitation “updating the demand database comprises considering the results of employing a data mining technique” recited in claim 3 (and similarly recited in claims 5 and 11) is clearly described at page 4, lines 8-10 of the originally filed specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6, 7, 12 and 15 have been canceled by the present Amendment, thereby rendering the rejection of claims 6, 7, 12 and 15 moot.

Regarding claims 17, 19, 20 and 21, Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. The Examiner is reminded that “[a]n applicant can show possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention, with all of its limitations, using words, structures, figures and diagrams” (see M.P.E.P. § 2163) (emphasis added by Applicants). As indicated above, the written description requirement is satisfied if the invention is disclosed in the drawings.

Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 2 of the originally filed specification clearly

indicates that if there is a match (40) a product is added to a list of a recommended product stockpile (42). Therefore, one skilled in the art would reasonably conclude the inventor had possession of the claimed invention, in view of Figure 2 of the originally filed specification.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to meet his initial burden with regard to the written description requirement. That is, in rejecting a claim, the examiner must set forth express findings of fact to support a lack of written description conclusion. The express findings should identify the claim limitation at issue and establish a *prima facie* case by providing reasons why a person skilled in the art at the time the application was filed would not have recognized that the inventor was in possession of the claimed invention (see M.P.E.P. § 2163.04). The Examiner has not provided any support for his rejections in the Office Action. Therefore, if the Examiner wishes to maintain this rejection, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide reasons why a person skilled in the art at the time the application was filed would not have recognized that the inventor was in possession of the claimed invention.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

III. THE 35 U.S.C. 101, DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1, 2, 3, 12 and 13 of United States Patent No. 6,732,099. Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention of claim 1 is not the same invention as that recited in claims 1, 2, 3, 12 and 13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,099.

That is, claim 1 of the claimed invention has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, “refining the data mining technique in cognizance of pattern changes embedded in said demand database and said supply database as a consequence of updating said demand database and said supply database”. This feature is not recited in the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,099.

The claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,099 do not recite refining the data mining technique as a consequence of updating said demand database and said supply database. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

IV. THE PRIOR ART REFERENCES

A. The Renslo Reference

The Examiner alleges that Renslo teaches the claimed invention of claims 1-7, 9 10-15 and 18. Applicants submit, however, that there are elements of the claimed invention, which are neither taught nor suggested by Renslo.

That is, Renslo does not teach or suggest “*refining the data mining technique in cognizance of pattern changes embedded in said demand database and said supply database as a consequence of updating said demand database and said supply database*” (emphasis Applicants’ as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 9, 10 and 13.

The Examiner attempts to rely on column 7, lines 47-50, column 8, lines 40-55 and Figures 14 and 15 of Renslo to support his allegations. The Examiner, however, is clearly incorrect.

That is, nowhere in these passages nor these figures (nor anywhere else for that matter) does Renslo teach or suggest a computer method that includes refining the data mining technique in cognizance of pattern changes embedded in the demand database and the supply database as a consequence of updating the demand database and the supply database. Indeed, Renslo merely teaches updating the knowledge base to change the generated forecasts.

Renslo teaches a forecasting system that provides a forecast of a factory’s product demand. The forecasting system generates forecasts using a forecasting algorithm and a knowledge base (20,22) (which the Examiner has analogized to the data mining technique of the present invention). The forecasting system also includes a relational database (26), which contains all of the product and forecast information, as well as order history and forecast results (see column 4, lines 7-9).

The forecasting system in Renslo further provides an updating means that updates the relational database (26) and updates the rules stored in the knowledge base (20,22). Renslo teaches that updating the rules in the knowledge base (20,22) results in changing the forecasts generated by the forecasting system (see Renslo at column 7, line 52 through column 8, line 2). That is, Renslo teaches updating the relational database (26) and the knowledge base (20,22) and that, based on this updating, the results generated by the system are changed.

Assuming, *arguendo*, that the knowledge base of Renslo teaches the claimed data mining technique, nowhere does Renslo teach or suggest refining the data mining technique in cognizance of pattern changes embedded in the demand database and the supply database as a

consequence of updating the demand database and the supply database. The knowledge base of Renslo is not updated as a consequence of changes made to the relational database. Renslo merely teaches updating the rules stored in the knowledge base. However, the updating of the knowledge base rules is not made as a consequence of changes made to the relational database of Renslo.

Furthermore, while the forecasting results of Renslo are changed based on the updates to the relational database and the knowledge base, this does not teach or suggest “*refining the data mining technique*” as recognized by exemplary aspects of the claimed invention. That is, altering the results obtained using the forecasting algorithm does not teach or suggest refining the forecasting algorithm itself.

Even assuming, arguendo, that the Examiner’s allegations are correct, Renslo does not teach or suggest refining the data mining technique as a consequence of updating the demand database and the supply database.

Therefore, Applicants submit that there are elements of the claimed invention that are not taught or suggest by Renslo. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

B. The Lu Reference

The Examiner alleges that Lu would have been combined with Renslo to form the claimed invention of claims 8 and 16. Applicants submit, however, that these references would not have been combined and even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Indeed, these references are directed to different problems and solutions. Specifically, Renslo is directed to the integration of a knowledge base with an automatically updated database to create optimized forecasting results (see Renslo at column 1, lines 60-66), whereas Lu is merely directed to applying neural networks to mine classification rules for large databases (see Lu at page 957). Therefore, these references are completely unrelated, and a person of ordinary skill in the art, attempting to improve Renslo, would have no reasonable motivation to consult the disparate reference Lu, absent impermissible hindsight.

Furthermore, the Examiner’s motivation to modify Renslo (“in order to have better a better predict result”) is not a problem in Renslo that would require a solution. Furthermore, Lu does not teach or suggest that neural networks provide improved results over knowledge

bases.

Thus, as pointed out in MPEP 2143.01, the Examiner's motivation is "improper". That is, "the mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination" (emphasis in MPEP itself).

Moreover, neither Renslo nor Lu, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests "*refining the data mining technique in cognizance of pattern changes embedded in said demand database and said supply database as a consequence of updating said demand database and said supply database*" as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 9, 10 and 13.

The Examiner attempts to rely on pages 957-961 of Lu to support his allegations. The Examiner, however, is clearly incorrect.

That is, nowhere in this passage (nor anywhere else for that matter) does Lu teach or suggest a computer method that includes refining the data mining technique in cognizance of pattern changes embedded in the demand database and the supply database as a consequence of updating the demand database and the supply database. Indeed, the Examiner does not even allege that Lu teaches or suggests this feature. The Examiner merely relies upon Lu as teaching the technique of using neural networks for data mining. Thus, Lu fails to make up for the deficiencies of Renslo.

Therefore, Applicants submit that these references would not have been combined as alleged by the Examiner and, even if combined, the alleged combination would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

C. The Bieganski Reference

The Examiner alleges that Bieganski would have been combined with Renslo to form the claimed invention of claims 17 and 19-21. Additionally, the Examiner alleges that Renslo would have been combined with Bieganski and Lu to teach the claimed invention of claims 22-24. Applicants submit, however, that these references would not have been combined and even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Indeed, these references are directed to different problems and solutions. Specifically,

Renslo is directed to the integration of a knowledge base with an automatically updated database to create optimized forecasting results (see Renslo at column 1, lines 60-66), whereas Bieganski is merely directed to generating a compatibility-aware recommendation output set based on a set of item compatibility rules (see Bieganski at page 957). Therefore, these references are completely unrelated, and a person of ordinary skill in the art, attempting to improve Renslo, would have no reasonable motivation to consult the disparate reference Bieganski, absent impermissible hindsight.

Furthermore, the Examiner's motivation to modify Renslo ("in order to provide a system with the ability to recommend items based on the compatibility of a new item with items already on the recommendation list") is not a problem in Renslo that would require a solution. That is, there is no teaching in Renslo that would provide any reasonable motivation or reason to include a recommendation list, as taught in Bieganski.

Thus, as pointed out in MPEP 2143.01, the Examiner's motivation is "improper". That is, "the mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination" (emphasis in MPEP itself).

Moreover, neither Renslo nor Bieganski, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests "*refining the data mining technique in cognizance of pattern changes embedded in said demand database and said supply database as a consequence of updating said demand database and said supply database*" as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 9, 10 and 13.

The Examiner attempts to rely on column 4, lines 65-67; column 5, lines 1-4; column 6, lines 13-17; column 7, lines 35-40 and column 10, lines 37-50 of Bieganski to support his allegations. The Examiner, however, is clearly incorrect.

That is, nowhere in this passage (nor anywhere else for that matter) does Bieganski teach or suggest a computer method that includes refining the data mining technique in cognizance of pattern changes embedded in the demand database and the supply database as a consequence of updating the demand database and the supply database. Indeed, the Examiner does not even allege that Bieganski teaches or suggests this feature. The Examiner merely relies upon Bieganski as teaching adding a product to a recommended product stockpile if the data mining technique determines there is a match between a classification of a demand feature from the demand database and a classification of a demand feature from the supply

database. Thus, Bieganski fails to make up for the deficiencies of Renslo.

Moreover, neither Renslo nor Bieganski, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests “*adding a product to a recommended product stockpile if the data mining technique determines there is a match between a classification of a demand feature from the demand database and a classification of a demand feature from the supply database*” as recited in exemplary dependent claims 19-21.

Contrary to the Examiner’s allegations, Bieganski does not teach or suggest “a match between a classification or a demand feature from the demand database and a classification of a demand feature from the supply database”, as recognized by an exemplary aspect of the claimed invention. Bieganski merely teaches reviewing past purchases, current purchases or user preferences of a customer. However, nowhere does Bieganski teach or suggest matching this information to a classification of a feature in a supply database. That is, nowhere does Bieganski even mention a supply database in the description of the invention.

Furthermore, it does not appear that the Examiner has even discovered a supply database in Bieganski. This is evident by the Examiners’ conclusory rejection, quoting the language recited in the claimed invention and listing long citations of the references that do not specifically compare the elements of the claimed invention to features in the cited reference.

Therefore, Applicants submit that these references would not have been combined as alleged by the Examiner and, even if combined, the alleged combination would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

V. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

On July 7, 2005 Applicants’ Representative conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner regarding the status of the Office Action dated June 6, 2005. The Examiner confirmed that the Office Action dated June 6, 2005 was a non-final Office Action.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1, 3, 5, 8-11, 13, 14 and 16-24, all of the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance,

Serial No. 10/620,445
Docket No. YOR920000590US2

14

the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Assignee's Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: September 6, 2005



Scott M. Tulino, Esq.
Registration No. 48,317

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

**MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW GROUP, PLLC**
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 48150